



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

A
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/557,739	04/25/2000	KEVIN B. GJERSTAD	1018.099US1	9937

7590 11/07/2003

MICHAEL J GROSS SHOOK HARDY & BACON LLP
ONE KANSAS CITY PLACE
1200 MAIN STREET
KANSAS CITY, MO 64105-2118

EXAMINER

SMITH, PETER J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2176

DATE MAILED: 11/07/2003 *o*

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/557,739

Applicant(s)

GJERSTAD ET AL.

Examiner

Peter J Smith

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 April 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 25 April 2000 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: application filed on 04/25/2000.
2. Claims 1-20 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 6, 9, and 20 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. **Claims 1-4, 6-7, 9, and 11-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Saunders, US 5,946,499 filed 05/10/1996.**

Regarding independent claim 1, Saunders discloses an application program owning a document in fig. 1 and 3. Saunders discloses a plurality of input device handlers, each handler having a corresponding input device and capable of entering text into the document in fig. 1 and col. 1 line 66 – col. 2 line 5. Saunders discloses a handler which returns correction content for display by an application program itself for text specified by the application program that was entered into a document by the handler in fig. 5, col. 1 lines 55-65, and col. 2 lines 6-51.

Saunders discloses a handler which displays a correction interface thereof for correction of text specified by the application program that was entered into a document by the handler in fig. 5 and col. 2 lines 30-51. Saunders discloses a mechanism to track entry of text into a document by a handler, such that each handler is associated with text it enters into the document

Art Unit: 2176

in fig. 1, 4a, 4b, and col. 1 lines 55-65. Saunders discloses a correction interface callable by an application program to determine a handler responsible for entering specified text into a document in col. 1 lines 55-65 and col. 2 lines 6-16.

Regarding dependent claim 2, Saunders discloses an application program which calls the method of an input device to request at least that the handler return the correction content such that the application program manages correction of the specified text itself in col. 2 lines 16-51.

Regarding dependent claim 3, Saunders discloses an application program which calls the method of handler to request at least that the handler display a correction interface thereof such that the handler manages correction of the specified text itself in col. 2 lines 16-51.

Regarding dependent claim 4, Saunders discloses a mechanism to track entry of text into a document by a handler associates each contiguous range of text entered into the document by a single handler to the single handler in fig. 5 and col. 2 lines 17-39.

Regarding independent claim 6, Saunders discloses a mechanism to track entry of text into a document owned by an application program by input device handler, such that each of a plurality of input device handlers is associated with text it enters into the document in fig. 1 and col. 2 lines 17-39. Saunders discloses a correction interface callable by an application program to determine an input device handler responsible for entering specified text into a document in fig. 4a, 4b, 5, col. 1 lines 55-65, and col. 2 lines 6-16.

Regarding dependent claim 7, Saunders discloses a mechanism which associates each contiguous range of text entered into the document by a single handler to the single handler in fig. 5 and col. 2 lines 17-39.

Regarding independent claim 9, Saunders discloses entering text into a document owned by an application by a handler for an input device, via a common text framework governing interaction between the application and the handler for the input device, such that the application exposes the document as an abstraction in fig. 1 and col. 1 lines 55-65. Saunders discloses tracking of text entered into a document by a handler for the input device by the common text framework in fig. 1, col. 1 lines 55-65, and col. 2 lines 6-30.

Regarding dependent claim 11, Saunders discloses requesting of the common text framework by the application of an identity of a particular handler responsible for entering specified text into a document and returning by the common text framework to the application the identity of the particular handler responsible for entering the specified text into the document in fig. 1, 4a, 4b, col. 1 line 55 – col. 2 line 30, and col. 2 lines 40-51.

Regarding dependent claim 12, Saunders discloses requesting the identity of the particular handler responsible for entering specified text into a specified range of the document in fig. 4a, 4b, 5, col. 1 lines 55-65, and col. 2 lines 6-40.

Regarding dependent claim 13, Saunders discloses requesting by the application of the particular handler to return correction content for the specified text for display by the application itself in fig. 4a, 4b, col. 1 lines 55-65, and col. 2 lines 6-16. Saunders discloses returning by the particular handler to the application the correction content for the specified text in fig. 4a, 4b, and col. 2 lines 6-51.

Regarding dependent claim 14, Saunders discloses displaying by the application of the correction content in col. 2 lines 30-51.

Regarding dependent claim 15, Saunders discloses an application which manages corrections to the specified text itself in col. 2 lines 6-51.

Regarding dependent claim 16, Saunders discloses requesting by the application of a particular handler that the particular handler display a correction interface thereof for correction of the specified text in fig. 4a, 4b, col. 1 lines 55-65, and col. 2 lines 6-30. Saunders discloses displaying by a particular handler of the correction interface in fig. 4a, 4b, and col. 2 lines 6-51.

Regarding dependent claim 17, Saunders discloses a particular handler which manages corrections to the specified text itself in col. 2 lines 6-51.

Regarding dependent claim 18, Saunders discloses requesting by the application of a particular handler that the particular handler display a correction interface thereof for correction of the specified text in fig. 4a, 4b, col. 1 lines 55-65, and col. 2 lines 6-16. Saunders discloses displaying by a particular handler of a correction interface in fig. 4a, 4b, and col. 2 lines 6-51.

Regarding dependent claim 19, Saunders discloses a particular handler which manages corrections to the specified text itself in col. 2 lines 6-51.

Regarding independent claim 20, Saunders discloses entering text into a document owned by an application by a handler for an input device, via a common text framework governing interaction between the application and the handler for the input device, such that the application exposes the document as an abstraction in fig. 1 and col. 1 lines 55-65. Saunders discloses tracking of the text entered into the document by the handler for the input device by the common text framework in fig. 1, col. 1 lines 55-65, and col. 2 lines 6-30.

Saunders discloses requesting of the common text framework by the application of an identity of a particular handler responsible for entering specified text into a document and

Art Unit: 2176

returning by the common text framework to the application the identity of the particular handler responsible for entering the specified text into a document in fig. 1, col. 1 line 55 – col. 2 line 30, and col. 2 line 40-51. Saunders discloses a handler which returns correction content for display by the application itself for a specified text in fig. 4a, 4b, col. 1 lines 55-65, and col. 2 lines 6-16. Saunders discloses a handler which displays a correction interface thereof for correction of a specified text in fig. 4a, 4b, and col. 2 lines 6-51.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. **Claims 5, 8, and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saunders, US 5,946,499 filed 05/10/1996 in view of Covington et al. (hereafter referred to as Covington), US 5,524,193 published 06/04/1996.**

Regarding dependent claim 5, Saunders teaches identifying a single handler for a contiguous range of text in fig. 4a, 4b, and 5. Saunders does not teach attaching a property to a contiguous range of text. Covington does teach attaching a property to a contiguous range of text in the abstract. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Covington into Saunders to create the invention as claimed. It would have been obvious and desirable to have modified Saunders so that a property could be attached to a range of text so that the mechanism could accommodate a more diverse

Art Unit: 2176

group of documents. This would have been a beneficial improvement since most documents are not solely composed of textual elements, but rather have other properties incorporated in their definition.

Regarding dependent claim 8, Saunders teaches identifying a single handler for a contiguous range of text in fig. 4a, 4b, and 5. Saunders does not teach attaching a property to a contiguous range of text. Covington does teach attaching a property to a contiguous range of text in the abstract. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Covington into Saunders to create the invention as claimed. It would have been obvious and desirable to have modified Saunders so that a property could be attached to a range of text so that the mechanism could accommodate a more diverse group of documents. This would have been a beneficial improvement since most documents are not solely composed of textual elements, but rather have other properties incorporated in their definition.

Regarding dependent claim 10, Saunders teaches identifying a range of text in a document in fig. 4a, 4b, and 5. Saunders does not teach attaching a property to a range of the document corresponding to the text entered. Covington does teach attaching a property to a range of the document corresponding to the text entered in the abstract. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Covington into Saunders to create the invention as claimed. It would have been obvious and desirable to have modified Saunders so that a property could be attached to a range of text so that the mechanism could accommodate a more diverse group of documents. This would have been a

Art Unit: 2176

beneficial improvement since most documents are not solely composed of textual elements, but rather have other properties incorporated in their definition.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Kida et al., US 5,659,769 published 08/19/1997 discloses a computer operating system Text Services Manager which operates as an interface between an application and a selection of text services, enabling the user to efficiently select from among a variety of text services without regard to the specific protocol requirements of the application. Tung et al., US 5,511,193 published 04/23/1996 discloses a Text Services Manager (TSM) which maintains and uses TSM documents to ensure proper communication between applications and their needed input methods. A TSM document comprises information about the input methods and text services used by a particular instance of an application. Greanias et al., US 5,157,384 published 10/20/1992 discloses in Fig. 1-3 and the abstract an advanced user interface which includes multiple input devices through which a user may interact with an application program. Hatayama et al., US 5,802,534 published 09/01/1998 discloses an apparatus and method for editing text.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Peter J Smith whose telephone number is 703-305-5931. The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays-Fridays 7:00am-3:30pm.

Art Unit: 2176

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph H Feild can be reached on 703-305-9792. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

PJS
September 11, 2003



SANJIV SHAH
PRIMARY EXAMINER